

**Equality Streets:
Parking in a Liveable Lambeth
Scrutiny Commission Report**

December 2016

Commission Members:

Councillor Nigel Haselden (Co-chair)
Councillor Robert Hill (Co-chair)
Councillor Diana Morris
Councillor Marsha de Cordova
Councillor Annie Gallop

Contact for enquiries:
Gary O'Key, Lead Scrutiny Officer
020 7926 2183
gokey@lambeth.gov.uk

Contents

Foreword by the Co-Chairs of the Commission	p2
List of Recommendations	p3
Introduction	p6
The Equality Streets Stakeholder Summit	p8
<i>Agenda</i>	<i>p9</i>
<i>Primer Report</i>	<i>p11</i>
<i>Minutes</i>	<i>p14</i>
<hr/>	
Section 1: Public Realm Design and Improvement	p24
Section 2: Parking Strategy	p26
Section 3: Enforcement & Joining Up of Environmental Functions	p30
Section 4: Communications	p31
<hr/>	
Annex 1: Acknowledgements	p33
Annex 2: Commission Scope	p34
Annex 3: Background documents	p38

Foreword by the Co-Chairs of the Commission

Everyone in Lambeth has an interest in parking, whether that interest is explicit or in the background of how we live our lives. It is important across all sections of the population.

This Scrutiny Commission was set up to test whether the borough's strategic parking policies were fit to address the physical and financial constraints of today, alongside Lambeth's ambition to be a clean and green borough. Our aim was to ensure that parking policy and practice will provide appropriately and equitably for the borough's future social needs and its environmental priorities. We wanted to identify ways that the frameworks defining parking provision can make our neighbourhoods more attractive, our town centres more viable and active travel easier.

Commission members noted a number of key aspects: two decades of controlled parking zones (CPZs), with over half the borough classed as a CPZ; only two out of five households having access to a car; much change in transport choices, with effective carrot-and-stick measures of a boost to car clubs alongside the introduction of emissions-based permits; the prevalence of parking in gardens and the frequent degrading of this public/private space and the undervaluing of the footway part of our highways; the value of pedestrians and cyclists to the high street economy; and a latent, but cautious interest in cycling shown by a significant part of the population.

The Commission structured its work around a primer report, collating headline data, main policies, stakeholder ambitions and external comparisons. We then convened a one-day public 'summit' with witnesses giving short contributions in a single communal hearing. Their various perspectives were discussed in an afternoon workshop, structured to produce a skeleton for our recommendation report. We are extremely grateful to our witnesses for their generous participation and core contributions. By general agreement, this was felt to be a valuable format of engagement and information-gathering and we're indebted to our facilitator, as recorded elsewhere in the report.

The Commission report is intended to accompany the borough's Parking Feasibility Study, due to complete at around the same time, and to contribute to decision-making deriving from that comprehensive piece of work. The Action Plan that will be generated by officers from our recommendations is also scheduled to contribute to the Lambeth Long Term Transport Strategy.

The Co-Chairs are also very grateful to our fellow commission member colleagues (named on the cover sheet); their time spent processing large amounts of evidence and their thoughtful shaping of the recommendations is much appreciated.

Our particular thanks go to Gary O'Key, the Lead Scrutiny Officer, for so effectively capturing and managing the wide-ranging commission material and organising our meetings in a timely way throughout the project.

Councillor Nigel Haselden, Commission Co-Chair and councillor for Clapham Town ward

Councillor Robert Hill, Commission Co-Chair and councillor for St Leonard's ward

List of Recommendations

Public Realm Design and Improvement

Recommendation 1

All public realm works should acknowledge the need for a balance between the priorities of different users. This should include those with children's buggies and a particular focus on vulnerable users and those that require assistance with their mobility, such as in the use of wheelchairs, scooters, walking frames or sticks, in accordance with Lambeth's policies on road user hierarchy and road danger reduction.

Recommendation 2

Greening should be routinely incorporated in all town centre and residential public realm schemes, including maximising planting, pocket parks and green corridors. The ideas put forward by the Trees & Design Action Group (TDAG) should be implemented where appropriate.

Recommendation 3

Decluttering and high quality signage for all street users should be embedded in neighbourhoods as default practice. Decluttering should include the removal of disused telephone boxes and more restrictions being put on use of A-boards.

Recommendation 4

Developments impacting the public realm should take into account the need for taxi ranks where appropriate while ensuring robust enforcement of engine idling.

Recommendation 5

The impact on uneven surfaces and changes in level on people with mobility difficulties should be routinely considered whenever footway development and maintenance takes place.

Parking Strategy

Recommendation 6

The Commission supports the principle of a borough-wide Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) (with different hours of operation in different areas as appropriate) and wishes to see this progressed, subject to consultation. Neither this nor the parking feasibility study should prevent the advance introduction of local parking restrictions where this is a response to evidenced needs.

Recommendation 7

Car club, cycle hangar and electric charging provision should be comprehensive, widespread (i.e. not just in affluent areas and including estates) and integrated into CPZ specification. Installation of cycle hangars should include consideration of non-standard-sized cycles, such as cargo bikes, tricycles, Christiana bikes and tandems.

Recommendation 8

The Council should encourage the use of pool bikes and use car clubs for essential staff travel in time for the completion of the Your New Town Hall project.

Recommendation 9

Network Rail should be lobbied to provide more accessible cycle storage in order to enable easier transport interchange.

Recommendation 10

One-way streets in the borough should be made two-way for cyclists as soon as possible where appropriate (taking into account the results of the Borough Wide Two-Way Cycling in One-Way Streets Study).

Recommendation 11

A cap on business permits should be introduced, with consideration given to a sliding scale whereby the number of permits allocated is based on demonstrable need (this could include factors such as the size and nature of the business). Additional permits should be obtainable above the cap but at a significantly increased cost.

Recommendation 12

Policy should be revised to create a presumption against new crossovers, with Planning to lead on decisions. Where crossovers are permitted, these should seek to minimise changes in level on the pavement (cf recommendation 6) and officers should positively explore the possibility of introducing an annual charge. Any such annual charge should not apply to disabled drivers, though the initial one-off fee should still apply.

Recommendation 13

Existing evidence regarding the importance of the “pedestrian pound” should be collated and presented to Business Improvement District (BID) members for dissemination in order to counter the commonly held belief that customers who drive are more valuable to businesses than those who walk or cycle. Consideration should also be given to commissioning Lambeth-specific research on the “pedestrian pound” to better ascertain the situation locally.

Recommendation 14

As with schools, all businesses in the borough should be encouraged to support sustainable travel. Sustainable travel plans should be promoted and should recommend cycle training which adheres to national standards.

Recommendation 15

The Council should work with Transport for London (TfL) and BIDs to better manage local freight consolidation and distribution to ensure there is adequate provision for deliveries. This could include reviewing policy on waiting and loading times.

Enforcement and Joining Up of Environmental Functions**Recommendation 16**

A more joined up environmental enforcement function should be established, aimed at consolidating a range of enforcement services including parking, anti-social behaviour (ASB), fly-tipping and dog fouling. This should be organised on a neighbourhood basis.

Recommendation 17

Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) should be equipped with appropriate technology to enable easy capturing and publishing of offences, and air quality monitoring.

Recommendation 18

Housing estates and streets should be considered equitably and in an integrated manner when public realm improvements are planned, and parking enforcement should be seamless across estates and streets, notwithstanding current and future permit charging regimes.

Communications

Recommendation 19

In order to support behaviour change, an awareness/publicity campaign in relation to enforcement of minor offences should be carried out, while also highlighting high profile prosecutions. A log of minor offences committed should also be published regularly.

Recommendation 20

The rights and responsibilities of blue badge holders in terms of parking in the borough should be better publicised.

Recommendation 21

Clear and comprehensive details of car and cycle parking across the borough should be made available online, based on a robust asset record database, as and when the information becomes available (the commission notes that the parking feasibility study will be gathering much of this data).

Recommendation 22

An awareness/publicity campaign should be conducted regarding the ways in which the parking surplus is spent.

Recommendation 23

Full use should be made of London Councils as a forum to share ideas and best practice, lobby the Mayor of London and central government and in particular contribute to the London Plan.

Introduction

Establishing the Commission

The Equality Streets Scrutiny Commission was established in spring 2015 following the submission of a commission proposal by Councillor Nigel Haselden, the then Scrutiny Vice Chair for Neighbourhoods, Environment & Sustainability. Using a holistic approach to vehicle parking – an issue of perennial interest to residents around the Borough – as its jumping-off point, the proposal was to examine wider public realm and sustainable transport issues, looking at the role and function of the borough's streets to ensure they are safe, attractive and fit for purpose, while also feeding into the development of the new Lambeth Long Term Transport Strategy. This linked strongly to two of the three overarching priorities in the Borough's key strategic document at the time, the *Community Plan* (Safer & Stronger Communities, and Cleaner Streets & Greener Neighbourhoods), as well as providing an opportunity to contribute to policy formation, and the Scrutiny Chairs were therefore content to authorise the commission.

During the summer of 2015, councillors were appointed and the range of the commission scoped. Members of the commission identified a number of core questions which they wanted to see addressed in the commission. These included:

- Does the council's strategic parking policy fit the constraints facing the borough and the ambitions it holds for a clean and green Lambeth?
- What opportunities are there for the council and partners to configure legislative, physical and financial aspects of vehicle parking policy and practice to play a positive part in our town centres and residential areas?

Based on these questions, the following terms of reference were agreed:

- To receive a summary of current policy
- To compare the provision and demand for parking in the borough, in alignment with the parking feasibility study, but including domestic off-street and cycle parking
- To identify how the frameworks defining controlled and wider parking provision can improve the attractiveness of neighbourhoods and make active travel easier.
- To consider the scope and possible benefits of a borough-wide CPZ.

Background and Context

Controlled parking, introduced in the mid-1990s, is in a mature state in Lambeth, but can sometimes conflict with good urban design and evolving transport practice; furthermore, only two in every five Lambeth households now run a car, with the trend heading for one in three, and people moving within and through Lambeth's neighbourhoods choose different modes, in much greater numbers, compared to earlier times (for example, at Vauxhall, in peak hours, only one in ten journeys is made by private car). Meanwhile pay-as-you-go motoring has mushroomed, with each car club vehicle providing the capacity equivalent of 20 private car usages, and cycling is becoming ever more popular. The Equality Streets commission's aim is to ensure that the borough's future social needs and environmental priorities are appropriately and equitably provided for within this context.

In 2015, it was announced that a borough-wide parking feasibility study was to take place to assess whether current operational controls still meet the needs of the local community. The study would enable the council to develop an up-to-date inventory of all parking spaces, disabled spaces, car club bays, loading bays, cycle parking and business parking in the borough. The Equality Streets commission has been timed to coincide with this, the idea

being that, taken together, these two pieces of work would provide qualitative and quantitative evidence to help shape policy governing the future layout and function of Lambeth's streets. At the time of writing it is anticipated that the parking feasibility study will report in spring 2017.

Officers are also working on a new *Long Term Transport Strategy* (also due for completion in the first half of 2017) which the Equality Streets commission seeks to influence. Indeed, at the Transport-themed Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 16 November 2016, the recommendations of the commission were reported alongside the Transport Strategy current baseline report (which constitutes part of the evidence base for the strategy) and these were discussed in tandem in order to ensure joined up thinking at a formative stage.

The commission's work comes at a time when Council resources are shrinking ever further and preventative approaches become ever more important. To this end the commission complements the *Health and Wellbeing Strategy* by promoting greater physical exercise through active travel, while also tying in with the *Air Quality Action Plan* in its ambition to reduce emissions.

The commission is also clear that its recommendations would have significant benefits for Lambeth's businesses; this relates not only the fact that customers who walk or cycle spend more in local shops than those who drive – contrary to popular belief (this is expanded on in section 2) – but also that greener, more attractive spaces are used by more people for longer periods, generating greater footfall and increasing takings. Indeed, the *Streatham Street Manual*, produced in 2014 by the Business Improvement District (BID) in Streatham – an organisation run by businesses, for businesses – recognises the positive impacts public realm improvements such as footway enhancements, decluttering and greening have on the local economy by making places more attractive to visit, observing that “it's social traffic that creates economic traffic”.

Finally, the commission's findings resonate with the *Borough Plan* (adopted by Cabinet in September 2016 to supersede the aforementioned *Community Plan*) in a number of ways. These include the ambitions for strong and sustainable neighbourhoods – including the 10-year aims to “make our streets places people feel proud to live and work in” and, in particular, “enable people to act more sustainably through redesigning highways and town centres to make them safer and encourage walking and cycling” – as well as the role of transport infrastructure in achieving inclusive growth. Despite the Borough Plan postdating the bulk of the commission, it is encouraging to note that the issues identified and recommendations made continue to chime with the Borough's priorities.

The Equality Streets Stakeholder Summit

In order to enable multiple stakeholders and interested parties to feed into discussions and ensure a range of views could be put forward, it was decided that the best format for the commission would be to convene a stakeholder “summit”, whereby a series of presentations and workshop sessions would be held on a single day. This approach enabled members to hear from local resident and business representatives, council officers, experts and interest groups without the need for a protracted series of meetings and burdensome time commitments. In order to achieve this, Paul Dodd, Director of public realm consultancy OutDesign, was commissioned to facilitate the event, working with council officers to devise a programme and carefully target invitees. The commission wishes to place on record its thanks to Paul for his hard work in making this a success.

The event took place on 21 September 2015 at Roots and Shoots in Kennington. Participants were provided with a primer report produced by Lambeth officers outlining the policy context and an outline agenda also including the commission scope. In the morning session, nine presentations were made covering such issues as streets and nature, car clubs, taxis and private hire vehicles, streets as public places, 20mph speed limits, and local town centre and neighbourhood views from Business Improvement Districts and resident bodies. Delegates then split into groups for themed discussion-based workshop sessions in the afternoon.

Following the summit session and in response to the evidence gathered, the commission co-chairs held a further series of meetings over a period of time with senior officers to seek clarification and probe further where necessary, to refine the initial thinking. All commission members then met to devise a series of recommendations, which were consulted on with stakeholders from the original event (including those who were invited but unable to attend) and further revised as a result of the feedback received.

The documentation from the stakeholder event, consisting of the agenda, primer report and minutes, can be found below. These documents, along with the references cited, provide the foundation for the main body of the report. This is split into four sections reflecting the commission’s key findings, around which its recommendations are grouped: Public Realm Design and Improvement; Parking Strategy; Enforcement and Joining Up of Environmental Functions; and Communications.

The full scoping document can be found at Annex 2 of this report.

Agenda

Equality Streets: Parking in a Liveable Lambeth

Date: 21st September 2015, 09.00-15.00pm

Venue: Roots & Shoots, Walnut Tree Walk, Kennington, London SE11 6DN

Lambeth's Overview and Scrutiny Committee has established a commission, led by Councillor Nigel Haselden (Overview and Scrutiny Vice Chair for Neighbourhoods, Environment and Sustainability) to look at the role and function of the borough's streets to ensure they are safe, attractive and fit for purpose. As someone with an interest in this area you are invited to a hands-on workshop to help shape the work and ensure that all voices are heard.

Lambeth's streets provide access for people, goods and services as well as being great places to meet. We will discuss how our streets can be designed to strike the right balance between the needs of movement and place. In addition we will consider the latest thinking on street design, servicing, and parking demand and management.

In the morning a variety of local interest groups and transport practitioners will deliver short presentations outlining their vision for our streets and spaces. In the afternoon we will discuss the main issues and objectives and work towards establishing a series of recommendations aimed at achieving this vision. The commission's final report and recommendations will be presented to the Council's Cabinet for consideration.

Draft Agenda

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 09.00 | <i>Registration</i> |
| 09.15 | Welcome and Introduction
Paul Dodd and Cllr Nigel Haselden |
| 09.30 | Equality Streets
John Dales |
| 10.00 | Taxis and Private Hire
Nicole Harris and Darren Crowson, Transport for London |
| 10.15 | Car Clubs
Naveed Ahmed, Transport for London |
| 10.30 | Clapham Society
Diana Bell |
| 10.45 | Norwood Amenity Group
Speaker tbc |
| 11.00 | Streets and Nature
Anne Jaluzot |
| 11.15 | Streets for People
Jack Skillen |

- 11.30** *Break*
- 11.45** 20's Plenty Campaign
 Jeremy Leach
- 12.00** Streatham BID
 Louise Abbotts
- 12.15** Waterloo BID
 Ben Stephenson
- 12.30** *Lunch*
- 13.30** Workshop: An afternoon breakout session would allow themes to be pursued and experiences to be compared. We will break into small groups and explore the following themes in more detail:

Innovation (Car clubs / cycle routes and signals / bus and tube improvements)

Town centres (Shopping, culture and leisure / Freight and deliveries / Interchange)

Residential streets (Green streets / sustainable drainage / housing estates)

Managing the street (Parking enforcement / CPZ / clean streets)

Health and well-being (Physical activity / air quality / speed and safety)

- 14.30** Feedback and Next Steps
 Cllr Robert Hill
- 15.00** Close

Primer report

Equality Streets – Parking in a Liveable Lambeth

Introduction

London's roads and streets play crucial roles for 'movement' and 'place'. They carry 80% of people's trips and 90% of freight, and make up 80% of the city's public space.

Growth in population and economic activity are intensifying the pressure on our roads, increasing the importance of thinking innovatively to tackle some of these challenges.

At a pan-London level the work of the Roads Task Force, set up by the Mayor of London in 2012 to tackle the challenges faced by London's streets, has provided firm focus on the competing demands on space at street level. In addition, Transport for London's recently published Health Action Plan has emphasised the important role of the street environment upon the quality of health for Londoners. With 24 million journeys being made by people and freight on London's roads every day, with development becoming increasingly dense and the ambition to improve the quality of places continuing to grow, it is an ideal time to consider these issues at a borough level.

At a regional level there has been a lot of work, principally by Transport for London, to assess how to better manage London's roads in the future. A considerable amount of work is taking place with the Freight Industry, focusing on initiatives such as retiming deliveries, different methods of delivery (i.e. consolidation centres and non-road based modes) and Construction Logistics Plans. In addition, 'car-lite' developments are supported, by providing a living environment that encourages people to walk and cycle. Car clubs and other complementary alternatives to private car ownership are actively supported.

Policy Context

Lambeth's Local Plan, scheduled for adoption in September 2015, provides a strong focus on the promotion of sustainable transport within the borough, minimising the need to travel and reducing dependence on the private car (Policy T1). In addition, objective 2 (paragraph 4.2.3) of the Lambeth Transport Plan (2011) references the council's approach to managing the quality, reliability and efficiency of the road network. The council has also published a Road Danger Reduction Strategy. This moves away from traditional road safety, which tends to focus on equipping vulnerable road users to move around in a dangerous environment, towards concentrating on reducing the causes of danger. Lambeth employs a road user hierarchy, with the most sustainable modes of walking and cycling prioritised above freight transport and the private car.

Part of Lambeth's overall approach to support sustainable travel patterns and address congestion issues is to control and manage the availability of parking - both on and off street (Policy T7 of the Local Plan). Parking controls are essential to ensure the efficient use of road space and manage the demand for parking. Car ownership is also falling within the borough, with only 42% of households now owning a car. This falling car ownership can create opportunities for new uses of streets in some parts of the borough, whilst in other parts of the borough there is still growing pressure on space for parking.

Lambeth's Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) were introduced area by area over many years, so now most, but not the entire northern half of the borough, where parking demand is at its highest, has CPZ coverage. Each CPZ has its own hours of operation with most zones operating between 8 and 12 hours, but some outside of town centres operating for two hours per day. Existing CPZs are due to be reviewed as part of the council's recently commissioned borough-wide Parking Feasibility Study, to see whether the operational controls still meet the needs of the local community. The Study will also enable the council to develop an up-to-date inventory of all parking spaces, disabled spaces, car club bays, loading bays, cycle parking and business parking in the borough. The Equality Streets process presents an opportunity to inform this process and help shape the future layout and function of Lambeth's streets.

In other parts of the borough Lambeth does not have CPZs and there are campaigns for parking controls to be introduced in some of these areas. There are also various major developments in these areas which potentially add to this parking stress. The Borough-wide Parking Feasibility Study will also review parking issues within these non-CPZ areas and develop a prioritisation list for future CPZ schemes.

In many parts of Lambeth, there are plenty of alternatives to the car for work, shopping and leisure trips, and "car-free" or low-car developments are supported, particularly in areas that benefit from good access to public transport facilities. Lambeth is densely developed with pressure for further development. Minimising parking provision within the development sites allows space for other uses and enables a more efficient use of land.

Lambeth's transport policies support increased innovation with respect to the use of the street environment, particularly around the use of car clubs and electric vehicles. Lambeth's Transport Plan (2011) Objective 3 documents information on the council's approach to improving air quality by increasing sustainable travel behaviour in the borough, but by also

supporting new forms of transport, including car clubs, electric vehicles, or the possibility of increased incentives for the use of low emission vehicles (i.e. reduced permit payments for fuel efficient vehicles).

Minutes

Scrutiny Commission: Equality Streets –Parking in a Liveable Lambeth Monday 21 September 2015 9am to 3pm at Roots & Shoots, Kennington

Attendees

Cllr Nigel Haselden (Commission co-chair), Cllr Rob Hill (Commission co-chair), Cllr Marsha de Cordova (Commission member), Cllr Diana Morris (Commission member), Cllr Annie Gallop (Commission member), Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite (Cabinet Member for Environment & Sustainability), Paul Dodd (Out Design), John Dales (Urban Movement), Gary O'Key (Lead Scrutiny Officer LBL), Raj Mistry (Programme Director, Environment LBL), Richard Lancaster (Programme Manager, Environment LBL), John Rider (Delivery Lead, Strategic Transport LBL), Peter Loveday (Transport Policy Manager LBL), Laura Cheyne (Road Danger Reduction Manager LBL), Andrew Round (Sustainability Manager LBL), Zak Aktas (CPZ Project Manager LBL), Diana Bell (Clapham Society), Martin Pratt (Clapham Society), Charlie Holland (Lambeth Cyclists), Anne Jaluzot (Green Infrastructure Planning), Isabelle Clement (Wheels for Wellbeing), Lucy James (National Management Trainee LBL), Andrea Hoffling (Kennington Oval & Vauxhall Forum), Louise Abbotts (Streatham BID), Ben Stephenson (Waterloo BID), Elaine Kramer (Van Gogh Walk), Nicole Harris (Taxi Ranks Liaison Officer TfL), Darren Crowson (Taxi Ranks Liaison Manager TfL), Naveed Ahmed (Car Clubs Officer TfL), Jeremy Leach (20's Plenty Campaign), Alan Piper (Brixton Society), Jack Skillen (Streets for People), Streatham Action Group representative

Introduction

Paul Dodd welcomed everyone to the event and stated that the aim was to understand the various pressures on our streets and environment, and associated contexts, and come up with recommendations to create a balance between these pressures and thus create better quality streets. The morning session would consist of brief presentations on a wide range of topics and the afternoon workshop would be a chance to discuss these in more depth.

Cllr Haselden explained that this was first and foremost a Scrutiny Commission; Scrutiny's role was to provide checks and balances on the executive. The Commission was tasked with devising a series of key points which in turn could form the basis of recommendations for the councillors and officers to take forward. A variety of residents, interest groups, professionals and council officers had been invited to contribute and it was hoped this range of perspectives would lead to a pertinent and balanced report to present to Cabinet.

Presentations

John Dales (Urban Movement): Equality Streets

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- John ran a small consultancy as well as chairing the Transport Planning Society. He was also a trustee of Living Streets and had worked with parliamentary select committees
- Streets were shared spaces and good street design was about getting the balance right in terms of the use of space
- Streets were complex places where everyone needed to be provided for, while roads were invariably about movement. Connotations for streets tended to be more positive than those for roads

- Streets tended to change in nature every few metres. It was not possible to design good streets by using numbers and formulae; this is what made it so fascinating
- The challenge was to try to embrace other things while you're doing your main task. This could include parking, shopping, commuting and leisure. No streets were perfect but failing to address the complexity would always result in a failing street
- Streets needed to provide facilities while considering people and activities
- Parking was always a means to an end rather than an end in itself; this had to be borne in mind
- Statements made by some politicians about lack of provision to park when "shopping locally" tended to chime with a lot of people but were completely unevidenced and had to be challenged. While it was true that some people may be buying large items or passing through on the way to somewhere else, and hence may favour the car, most people walk to local shops
- Studies had been done on this and found that shopkeepers consistently overestimated how many customers came by car; also, evidence showed that while drivers spent more per visit, pedestrians spent more on average per month
- Parking charges were often maligned but it should be remembered that parking space is a valuable local resource
- Shopkeepers needed to take some responsibility for the upkeep of their frontages
- The removal of guard railings could open up much more space and also tended to improve road safety as drivers and pedestrians engaged more with each other
- Streets needed to be designed around the needs of people, not just cars
- Whatever recommendations the commission chose to make needed to be evidence-based and good for local streets; indeed it could be argued that the best way to use the commission's resources would be to collect robust evidence on which to base future policies

Nicole Harris / Darren Crowson (TfL): Taxis / Private Hire Vehicles

A verbal presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- TfL licensed black cabs and private hire vehicles (PHVs); this included minicabs, community transport vehicles and dial-a-ride
- Black cabs could use a rank and ply for hire on the streets but PHVs had to be pre-booked through a licensed operator. TfL appointed taxi ranks in all London Boroughs; these could be appointed to serve a variety of venues/locations such as hospitals, stations or shops/bars
- There needed to be adequate space for taxi ranks to cope with demand as well as clear sight lines
- All taxis were fitted with wheelchair ramps, swivel seats and hearing loops, and there was a wide range of PHVs some of which were adapted for customers with mobility requirements
- Taxis and PHVs needed to be able to set down and pick up passengers safely
- Taxi ranks helped serve the night time economy and also helped disperse large crowds, reducing ASB and allowing people to get home safely
- The location of taxi services and the requirements of passengers had to be carefully considered
- TfL commented on planning applications for major developments at an early stage to ensure taxi requirements were considered but this could sometimes be missed with smaller applications. Lambeth did not have a single point of contact for taxis in the way some other boroughs did
- Taxis and PHVs amounted to pay-as-you-go motoring and therefore had a role in reducing reliance on private cars

- TfL was developing guidance about what a good taxi rank looks like
- The removal of the taxi rank in central Brixton when the Windrush Square development was carried out had caused a big problem as there was a great deal of demand
- TfL had a list of taxi ranks which could help in assessing where the gaps lie; this could be provided
- All new taxis were zero-emission capable and training was being considered for drivers around smarter driving to reduce pollution

Naveed Ahmed (TfL): Car Clubs

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- There were big increases projected in London's population over the next 10-15 years and it was vital to look at mitigating congestion and air pollution
- Congestion had economic and environmental impacts
- The 2013 Roads Task Force report looked at how to improve the situation; this contained a key recommendation regarding reducing car ownership and usage
- On average people only used their cars 3% of the time so it made sense to look at possibilities for sharing via car clubs
- Ongoing research was being done looking at the potential demand for switching personal journeys from private cars to car clubs
- Car clubs consisted of vehicles provided by car rental companies on the public road for use on a pay as you go basis. The pricing structure encouraged short term use
- Public transport provision was also an important factor
- London had around 80% of all car club vehicles and members
- The main car club operators had been brought together to form a coalition
- Promotion of car clubs and buy-in from local groups was important
- Car club vehicles tended to be among the greenest available
- Appropriate infrastructure for electric vehicles was vital
- Boroughs determined where their car club spaces were and each had different criteria; this might include prioritising areas where public transport was not so good and/or areas of social deprivation
- Lambeth was among the most popular boroughs for car club membership
- One of the actions in the car club strategy concerned working with businesses such as estate agents or local authorities to make vehicles available outside office hours

Diana Bell (Clapham Society): Front Garden or Car Park?

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- Two thirds of London's front gardens had been paved over for parking – this amounted to 12 square miles or 22 times the size of Hyde Park
- Front gardens were important for irrigation as green areas absorbed water back into the ground and trees and plants took up water
- Paved areas increased water run-off into overloaded Victorian drains and resulted in a loss of habitat for wildlife
- Trees needed to be seen as “green architecture”
- Appropriately sized trees made the road appear narrower and softened/screened houses

- Hedges and trees helped define the pedestrian zone and make the road less dominant
- There were also issues with modern paving eroding the character of conservation areas, resulting in a loss of local identity
- Houses in single family occupation could currently convert gardens into car parking space as permitted development but it was possible to issue an Article 4 direction to take away such rights

Norwood Action Group: Local View

Nobody was available to attend from Norwood Action Group but the following written statement was received from the NAG Chair, Rob Andrew, and circulated:

This is drafted by Rob Andrew, chair of Norwood Action Group (which also represents Tulse Hill and Lambeth portion of Upper Norwood), though without the benefit of contribution or ratification by the Group.

To declare my interests, I travel locally mainly on foot or by bicycle, by bus or train into London and by car out of London and east-west – West Norwood has poor east-west public transport links.

Firstly, I would like to comment on a couple of assertions. Streets are not often great places to meet. The poor standard of street cleansing and maintenance determines this just as much as traffic and parking. Even if improved, there are better places to meet.

The comment in the brief: “In many parts of Lambeth...” should be fully understood and not be lost in the ongoing progress. Unlike most of Lambeth, our area at the southern tip of Lambeth is not urban, but suburban as acknowledged and designated in the Lambeth Local Plan. We do not have the short distances between key features and density of transport of the middle and north of the borough. Therefore there is not a broad-brush borough-wide approach that is appropriate.

The thrust of Lambeth policy is to reduce car journey miles and support alternatives. This has to be carefully considered in our locality for numerous reasons.

For example, the vast increase in children of school age in our neighbourhood means that all schools are vastly oversubscribed and forecast to continue to progressively worsen despite the planned increase in local school places. This means that many parents are having to take children to schools some miles away by car due to poor east-west transport, often to more than one school due to inability of siblings’ policy to provide for all siblings.

Our area is hilly: the main shopping street is in the centre of a natural valley going steeply uphill to the south and west, less so to the east and north. This means that many less-able rely on car use. Cyclists are often daunted by the gradients on many roads, especially if not young and ‘cycle-hardened’.

We have virtually no off-street parking but there is one CPZ in the Tulse Hill area which is failing local needs. Ostensibly to deter commuter parking, it operates from 8 till 7pm, almost all ‘resident-only’ use. These streets in daytime have few resident vehicles, meanwhile local shops struggle. The parking wishes of commuters can still be thwarted and the needs of others – the less able to reach shops – could be met with, for example, a 1 or 2 hour limit on parking.

To aid local business, we would suggest a method used by Croydon, machines that issue a free 20 minute ticket as well as accepting payment for longer stays.

Air quality concerns us all, so for this and other reasons we are not unequivocal supporters of unfettered car use. However we do wonder about some policies with unintended consequences: the forthcoming 20mph limit on all borough roads, even the main feeder routes. Cars, buses and trucks driving in low gear and excessive humps causes a sharp rise in pollution per vehicle journey.

Locally we have a number of initiatives that are relevant, so hasty action would be inexcusable. A Lambeth Council review of the West Norwood and Tulse Hill Masterplan is underway and due to report in early 2017. This should consider the streets and parking issues in a holistic way. Evidence to this can inform the subject of this workshop.

In addition, two local planning forums are in the process of initiation under the 2011 Localism Act: Norwood Planning Assembly and Tulse Hill Planning Forum. There are also two long standing community groups Norwood Forum and Norwood Action Group. Any plans or implementation without proper engagement with all would be totally unacceptable.

Finally, as in the rest of Lambeth we are experiencing a rapid increase in population. Whilst it could be argued that certain policies and plans are beneficial in the current context, the vision has to be long-term. We recall school closure due to falling demand in the quite recent past; this failed to anticipate future need as reflected in our locally (and nationally) desperate situation. We would not wish to see ill-founded actions that roll-on just because they have currently gained some traction.

Anne Jaluzot (Green Infrastructure Planning): Streets and Nature

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- Nature needed to be seen as an infrastructure response to local needs, as opposed to just another feature on our streets requiring space and funding
- Tree planting was an essential ingredient of most traffic calming and environmental enhancement schemes
- Trees and plants could be used to change the perception of the width of streets, resulting in more appropriate driving speeds; this also reduced collisions and deaths/injuries. Drivers were also better able to gauge their speed on tree-lined roads due to the parallax effect
- Trees and planting in the middle of the road and cut-ins provided easier crossing for pedestrians while adding texture and colour, making the street more welcoming and enabling more enhanced use of footways
- Appropriately positioned vegetation helped guide people around intersections, provide spatial references and gently segregate modes of transport
- An attractive street environment better allowed for safe coexistence of different road users
- There were some constraints regarding tree planting and these needed to be carefully considered to avoid causing hazards or surface upheaval
- Vegetation could act as irrigation and air conditioning and also attract wildlife
- Evidence of the health benefits of nature on streets was overwhelming and had been summarised by the University of Washington (see <http://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/>)
- Greener streets also increased consumers' dwell times and willingness to spend money

- It was important to understand the links to funding across various areas of the organisation; maximising these required effective collaboration and strategic attention needed to be paid to treating the greening of streets as a change programme
- The publication *Trees in Hard Landscapes: A Guide for Delivery*, which was available free online, expanded on these ideas

Jack Skillen (Streets for People): Streets as Public Places

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- Walking was a way of getting around that included everyone and pedestrian organisations had a long history
- Walking could be encouraged by a range of measures from drop kerbs to bigger town centre schemes and infrastructure changes. Streets for People were currently working on schemes in Tooting and Peckham to make areas safer and get more people walking
- Smarter road pricing could help alleviate congestion and pollution; this included parking
- Streets for People carried out street audits to understand more about how people moved around and used streets, though this had not been done extensively in Lambeth
- Schemes to encourage walking to school added social value by benefitting health, community relations, education and people's general outlook. Parking around schools was a big issue and some streets had been temporarily closed down at certain times to encourage walking to school in Camden and Hackney
- Older people could become disconnected and lonely if streets were not conducive to walking
- Streets for People had held a recent meeting with the GLA, TfL and ten London Boroughs but this did not include Lambeth (though they would like to be more involved here)
- Measures to encourage walking required some initial investment – mainly in terms of time – but saved money in the long term and helped the local economy by increasing footfall in town centres
- Cycling also had very positive effects and should be encouraged but there were areas of possible conflict with pedestrians
- Cycling pressure groups seemed more vocal than pedestrian ones and it was felt walkers sometimes came off worse when public realm improvements were made, such as having pavement widths reduced

Jeremy Leach (20's Plenty for Us): 20mph Speed Limit

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- The 20's Plenty campaign sought to achieve a fairer balance between people and vehicles by way of lowering speeds
- They also wished to tackle the decline in walking by making sure streets were fit for pedestrians. This in turn would have positive health benefits
- 20mph zones were widely supported
- Research showed that introducing a 20mph limit reduced speeds by between 1 and 1.5mph on average, though doubts were raised about the robustness of these statistics

- Reducing the speed limit to 20mph reduced noise pollution, accident frequency and casualties, and increased active travel (walking and cycling), while having a neutral effect on journey times
- Enforcement was crucial, yet there were concerns over the resource implications for the police

Louise Abbotts (Streatham Business Improvement District (BID)): Local View

A verbal presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- Streatham BID represented 550 local businesses who had chosen to invest in the area to make Streatham a better place to live, work and do business
- Investment in lighting and central reservation works had taken place on the High Road
- A change in demographic was occurring in Streatham
- Streets were becoming like a “living room” where people met and had social interactions
- There were quite a lot of parking facilities in Streatham but many were sub-standard in terms of the quality of paving, lighting and signage
- Lots of parking was linked to shops where purchases were necessary to use the car park
- Many of the side streets had no parking controls and these were often used by commuters
- It would be helpful if loading bays could be shared use
- Streatham had a thriving town centre but the High Road was also a key arterial route; this meant a balance was required. There did not currently appear to be a strategy for the area which looked at public realm in terms of the variety of road users and associated conflicts
- There were very active business and residential communities in Streatham that were keen to engage
- There needed to be a 360 degree review of all transport options in Streatham – trains, buses, walking and cycling

Ben Stephenson (Waterloo Business Improvement District (BID)): Waterloo Streets

A PowerPoint presentation and brief Q&A session took place during which the following key points were made:

- London had a high population density and this led to problems with modal conflict
- Waterloo BID were involved in making community-led improvements to local streets and wanted to be the local interface between TfL and the community
- Current schemes included work on Westminster Bridge Road to reduce the impact of the car and improve the public space
- There was a great deal of railway infrastructure in the north of the borough; this could be seen both as a problem and an opportunity
- While high quality design was desirable it should not be at the expense of affordable long term maintenance
- There were a number of policies and strategies related to Waterloo including the streetscapes design guide, Southbank public realm strategy and retail strategy
- It was felt that TfL’s Roads Task Force agenda was slipping and retreating into silos
- The reliance on cars even in places as well served by public transport as Waterloo showed the significant barriers that had to be overcome

- The occupancy of the National Theatre car park was fairly low but parking for the Hayward Gallery would be moving over when works started there

Workshops

The following workshops took place:

Group 1: Management of our Streets

Cllr Haselden, John Dales, Zak Aktas, Raj Mistry, Andrea Hoffling, Elaine Kramer, Jeremy Leach

The key points raised were as follows:

- There were problems with the cleanliness of streets including litter and fly-tipping – was this a collection issue or did people not care enough to keep the streets clean?
- There needed to be better joined up working between different areas of the council
- Campaigns such as Do The Right Thing were positive in terms of awareness raising, and work with local businesses and volunteers was helpful, but high profile examples of enforcement were also needed to deter people
- The true value of inner London parking spaces had to be realised; public spaces were for everyone and it was a privilege for motorists to park in them
- A strong case needed to be made to levy the cost of parking by making sure positive benefits – such as freedom passes – were understood
- The emergence over several years of a number of CPZs – some very localised – meant they were difficult to regulate. Protection from commuter parking near stations was also needed
- Planning and Highways should talk to each other regarding restricting crossovers
- Small pocket parks could be created from redundant parking spaces
- The remit of civil enforcement officers could be expanded to cover other kinds of ASB (such as dog fouling and litter) in order that they became the council's first point of contact

Group 2: Town Centres

Cllr Hill, Cllr De Cordova, Laura Cheyne, Peter Loveday, John Rider, Charlie Holland, Louise Abbotts

The key points raised were as follows:

- Town centres need to be the heart of the community and the needs of various interests had to be balanced
- Well planned public realm improvements could create more of a focus and encourage social use of town centres
- It was important to learn from best practice (examples in Rye Lane (Peckham) and Regent Street were cited)
- Well planned and considerate delivery strategies could relieve daytime congestion
- Central parking areas were best but these should be replacement rather than additional spaces
- There was a strong need to coordinate activities within the council such as planning, licensing, highways and regeneration
- The preference was for segregated cycle lanes where possible to maximise safety and minimise conflict
- The needs of pedestrians should not be neglected

- Safety was a key concern and input should be sought from vulnerable users and groups including RNID, RNIB and Guide Dogs for the Blind
- Good signage was important to help people find their way but Legible London signage was expensive; TfL could be lobbied on the cost and/or on allowing boroughs to develop their own signage
- Having local businesses meet local needs would reduce the need for people to travel
- More thought needed to be given to the sharing of spaces

Group 3: Residential Areas

Cllr Gallop, Cllr Morris, Richard Lancaster, Andrew Round, Isabelle Clement, Martin Pratt, Lucy James

The key points raised were as follows:

- It was important to think about estates as well as streets when considering the quality of the residential environment
- Green projects on estates could achieve the same aim as the greening of residential streets and in the process create “green corridors”
- Policies should encourage active travel for everyone to avoid isolation and vulnerability
- The environment had to work for everyone including those with mobility issues of various kinds; this included the need to ensure pavements were well maintained
- Local people should be encouraged to take responsibility, ownership and interest in their streets (the NEP was helping with this)
- While lots of car journeys could be substituted it had to be borne in mind that some car journeys were essential (eg for carers)
- Lots of paving of front gardens was outside permitted development rights yet this did not tend to be enforced. A high profile campaign of enforcement against a few such developments could yield good results from limited expenditure
- The ideas in the Streets and Nature presentation were very interesting and should be explored but it was important to ensure the right substructure to make sure tree roots did not make pavements uneven
- More information needed to be made available to people on the alternatives to private cars (this included new parents, who often felt they had to have a car). The cost of all the equipment required for parents to be able to pick and mix from the different modes might be a disincentive. Encouraging reuse and recycling could help
- Awareness had to be raised with regards to car club schemes (this was done on new developments but not so much elsewhere)
- Green roofs should be encouraged
- Additional CPZs might improve the street scene in some parts by restricting commuter parking
- The competition for road space could result in some modes disadvantaging others (eg cyclists slowing down buses)

Summing Up

In closing the event, Cllr Hill thanked everyone for coming. A great deal of interesting thoughts and big ideas had been raised in a short period of time, which would give members of the commission plenty to think about. Some of the key points made concerned the perception people had of streets, streetscape design (including planting and greenery), and the importance of effective enforcement. It was vital to listen to all views and learn from good practice, making sure recommendations were well-evidenced and compatible with other activity, such as the Neighbourhood Enhancement Programmes, parking stress survey,

cycle quietways and the ongoing development and population rise in the borough. Sharing of information and effective working across teams and organisations would be vital.

Section 1: Public Realm Design and Improvement

The issues considered by the Equality Streets Scrutiny commission are many and varied, and can sometimes provoke strong debate, but if there is one generally accepted principle which resonates from the stakeholder summit and the multitude of sources referenced in this report, it is the recognition that streets are shared spaces which can only be successful when they achieve an appropriate *balance* between the amenities they provide and the people that use them – be they pedestrians, public transport users, cyclists or motorists; young or old; commuters or shoppers; visually impaired or wheelchair users. The commission notes that the Lambeth Transport Plan 2011 includes a road user hierarchy, setting out the order of priority for modes of travel as below, and endorses this approach – placing a particular focus on those with mobility issues – while reiterating that it is necessary to consider the needs of all groups when planning public realm works.

Lambeth road user hierarchy

1 Walking; 2 Cycling; 3 Buses; 4 Taxis and Minicabs; 5 Powered two wheelers; 6 Freight transport; 7 Cars

As set out in the introduction, the commission aims to make our streets and town centres more attractive and healthy places to be and one particularly important element of this is the presence of nature. The commission found the presentation from the Trees and Design Action Group (TDAG) at the stakeholder event to be particularly inspiring in this regard, challenging as it did the perception of trees and planting as “just another feature on our streets requiring space and funding” and reframing nature as a response to infrastructure needs, including traffic calming, drainage and way-finding. The commission also notes the considerable health benefits of greening, as referenced in the presentation, while the economic gains resulting from consumers’ increased dwell times in greener spaces are a vital, oft-overlooked by-product. For all these reasons, the commission endorses the ideas put forward by TDAG and would like to see these considered and implemented wherever feasible in future public realm improvement schemes.

Another principle that the commission wishes to see taken forward is that of decluttering the public highways wherever possible in order to create spaces which are not only more open and welcoming but easier to navigate, especially for those who may have mobility problems and require walking sticks or wheelchairs, but also buggy users. It is noted that Transport for All, in their article *Zero-tolerance on A-boards welcomed by disabled people*, make a compelling case for restrictions on advertising boards which are placed on the pavement outside business premises, outlining the difficulties they can cause for wheelchair users, but also wishes to see this principle extended to street furniture which is unnecessary or redundant (such as disused telephone boxes). Related to this, and following up an issue raised at the stakeholder session workshop discussions, the commission believes high quality signage is important to help people find their way, and notes that the London Councils *Code of Practice for Affixing Traffic Signs and Street Lighting to Buildings in London* – adopted by Cabinet in February 2016 – provides a blueprint for achieving this while further supporting the principle of decluttering. Well maintained pavements are also paramount and in particular the commission wishes to see routine consideration of the impact of changes in level on vulnerable people, noting how difficult it can be for those with mobility difficulties to negotiate such steps up or down.

As part of the stakeholder session the commission received a presentation from Transport for London officers on taxis and private hire vehicles (PHVs). Among the points made was their role in the night time economy and the importance of the service to those with mobility requirements. While it is noted that taxis are lower in the road user hierarchy than active

travel such as walking and cycling, and public transport, nevertheless the commission recognises that taxis and PHVs are in effect pay-as-you-go motoring which reduce reliance on private motor vehicles, and for some are an invaluable form of transport. For these reasons the commission wishes to see taxi ranks taken into account when public realm developments take place. However, in order to support air quality commitments it is vital that engine idling is tackled robustly at such ranks.

Recommendation 1

All public realm works should acknowledge the need for a balance between the priorities of different users. This should include those with children's buggies and a particular focus on vulnerable users and those that require assistance with their mobility, such as in the use of wheelchairs, scooters, walking frames or sticks, in accordance with Lambeth's policies on road user hierarchy and road danger reduction.

Recommendation 2

Greening should be routinely incorporated in all town centre and residential public realm schemes, including maximising planting, pocket parks and green corridors. The ideas put forward by the Trees & Design Action Group (TDAG) should be implemented where appropriate.

Recommendation 3

Decluttering and high quality signage for all street users should be embedded in neighbourhoods as default practice. Decluttering should include the removal of disused telephone boxes and more restrictions being put on use of A-boards.

Recommendation 4

Developments impacting the public realm should take into account the need for taxi ranks where appropriate while ensuring robust enforcement of engine idling.

Recommendation 5

The impact on uneven surfaces and changes in level on people with mobility difficulties should be routinely considered whenever footway maintenance and development takes place.

Section 2: Parking Strategy

One of the initial drivers for this commission was the need to look at parking controls and related arrangements in the borough in order to ensure that they are fit for purpose and do not stand in the way of good urban design and progressive transport policy. As stated in the introduction, many of the current controlled parking zones (CPZs) date back two decades or more, and the commission feels it is necessary to update and regularise parking across the borough to take account of developments and trends in car usage and support the variety of transport modes used by Lambeth residents in a more balanced and nuanced way. This includes greater emphasis on active travel to promote health and wellbeing and improve air quality, recognising the growing trend for car clubs (which tend to use low emission vehicles) as an alternative to car ownership, and promoting the use of electric vehicles. As stated, the Parking Feasibility Study is auditing the borough's streets to produce an inventory of parking provision and it is anticipated that this, coupled with the Equality Streets work, will help provide a steer to policymakers as to how the supply of parking space – finite and valuable resource that it is – can be re-evaluated to better support the council's strategic aims in relation to transport and the environment.

The commission's key recommendation in this regard is to support, in principle, the introduction of a borough-wide CPZ. It is important to note that the commission recognises there are big differences between different parts of the borough and it is not proposed to treat all areas identically as this would be inappropriate. However, it is considered that a borough-wide CPZ would address issues of displacement that currently arise when new parking controls are introduced with a whole-borough vision, tackle problems in currently unregulated areas where commuter parking (particularly around stations) has an adverse effect on local residents, and also support strategic planning. It is accepted that a borough-wide CPZ would need to be introduced incrementally, with priority given to areas identified as having the greatest need by the Parking Feasibility Study; furthermore different areas would have different hours of operation to respond to local circumstances, and parking controls should always be subject to consultation and be supported by local residents and businesses. Nevertheless the commission sees many benefits of regularising the approach to parking across the borough in this way. As well as residential parking, the commission also wishes to see some controls on business parking permits in order that parking space is appropriately rationed. This is intended to be fair and even-handed as opposed to penalising businesses unnecessarily, and therefore a cap is proposed based on demonstrable need (it is envisaged this would take into account multiple factors including the size and nature of the business but it would be for officers to determine appropriate criteria and weighting).

Following on from the above, the commission sees the potential expansion of CPZ coverage across the borough as an opportunity to reconfigure parking provision to better support alternative modes, including increasing electric car charging points, car club bays and cycle parking. The commission foresees these as elements which would be considered on a "checklist" of measures to be considered each time a new CPZ is consulted on or designated, thus allowing a more integrated approach. Such provision should be comprehensive and widespread in order that there is equality of access across the borough. It is also recognised that the cycle hangars currently used do not allow for non-standard cycle types which can make them inaccessible to particular groups and therefore recommends consideration of tandems, cargo bikes, Christiana bikes and other non-standard cycle types when new cycle hangars are procured and installed. It is recognised also that as well as increasing cycle parking provision in local neighbourhoods, in order to fully unlock latent demand for commuter cycling it is necessary to provide more cycle parking at stations, and the commission recommends Network Rail be lobbied on this.

In promoting active travel the commission considers the council could lead by example by using the move to the new Town Hall as an opportunity to roll out the use of pool bikes and car clubs for essential staff travel much more widely. In tandem with this it should also be a priority to encourage businesses to support sustainable travel by adopting similar practices to those currently employed in the majority of the borough's schools, including drawing up and implementing sustainable travel plans for their workforce and providing appropriate cycle training.

A further measure to encourage cycling, particularly among those who may be reluctant to cycle because of traffic, would be the redesignation of one-way streets in the borough to be two-way for cyclists. The commission notes that Lambeth commissioned a study on this issue in early 2016 which concluded that the vast majority of the borough's one-way streets could be converted and wishes to see it acted on without delay – taking into account the assessments made regarding safety aspects and the cost of conversion.

While on-road parking is the most obvious area to look at when considering recommendations for parking strategy, the commission is also concerned at the increasing number of front gardens being paved over for parking and the effects this can have on wildlife, irrigation and flood risk; the erosion of character and local identity, particularly in conservation areas; and the fairness of the parking system. These issues were explored at the stakeholder session and reinforce the findings of the Greater London Assembly Environment Committee's 2005 report *Crazy Paving: The Environmental Importance of London's Front Gardens*. One measure the commission envisages could halt the alarming loss of front gardens is for policy to be revised to create a presumption against crossovers – dropped kerbs allowing vehicular access to front gardens – with Planning to lead on decisions and Highways to implement the works where agreed. Furthermore, the commission would like to see crossovers regularised, with annual charges applied in the same way as on-street parking permits (though it is proposed that this would be waived for disabled drivers). The commission is unaware of any other local authorities applying such a charge, and it is recognised that this may therefore require careful legal consideration, but such innovative solutions need to be examined to ensure the council is doing all it can to address the issues associated with parking in front gardens.

A key aim of this commission is to play a part in ensuring Lambeth's neighbourhoods and town centres are attractive and thriving places, and achieving this is simply not possible without a strong local economy. It is therefore vital that businesses are supported by the actions proposed. While the perception among many businesses is that any measures to restrict parking and encourage more walking and cycling will negatively affect takings, the truth is actually somewhat different; commission members heard at the stakeholder event of the wealth of evidence which proves that those who walk, cycle or use public transport are actually more valuable to businesses than those who drive. This is well summarised in the Living Streets report *The Pedestrian Pound: The Business Case for Better Streets and Places* – which presents evidence to show that shoppers on foot spend up to *six times* as much as drivers – as well as successive Transport for London *Town Centre Studies*, all of which reach the same broad conclusion. The commission is therefore clear that measures which promote active travel and encourage longer dwell times – as is the case with many of the recommendations – can only be good for businesses. In order to make this clearer to businesses and counter the misconceptions, it is recommended that local Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) circulate the evidence on this topic to their members, and that, in recognition of the fact that the studies done on this so far are focused on other areas, consideration be given to commissioning Lambeth-specific research to ascertain the situation locally – which, the commission believes, will further reiterate what is already published.

Another element in need of consideration when looking at parking and traffic flow is freight, which is responsible for an increasing amount of the traffic on our roads as more of our shopping moves online. The commission recommends more joint working between BIDs and Transport for London to explore innovative ways of managing this more effectively, such as using consolidation centres and retiming deliveries, while proposing that a review of waiting and loading times be carried out to see whether the current arrangements need to be amended to remain fit for purpose.

Recommendation 6

The Commission supports the principle of a borough-wide Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) (with different hours of operation in different areas as appropriate) and wishes to see this progressed, subject to consultation. Neither this nor the parking feasibility study should prevent the advance introduction of local parking restrictions where this is a response to evidenced needs.

Recommendation 7

Car club, cycle hangar and electric charging provision should be comprehensive, widespread (i.e. not just in affluent areas and including estates) and integrated into CPZ specification. Installation of cycle hangars should include consideration of non-standard-sized cycles, such as cargo bikes, tricycles, Christiana bikes and tandems.

Recommendation 8

The Council should encourage the use of pool bikes and use car clubs for essential staff travel in time for the completion of the Your New Town Hall project.

Recommendation 9

Network Rail should be lobbied to provide more accessible cycle storage in order to enable easier transport interchange.

Recommendation 10

One-way streets in the borough should be made two-way for cyclists as soon as possible where appropriate (taking into account the results of the Borough Wide Two-Way Cycling in One-Way Streets Study).

Recommendation 11

A cap on business permits should be introduced, with consideration given to a sliding scale whereby the number of permits allocated is based on demonstrable need (this could include factors such as the size and nature of the business). Additional permits should be obtainable above the cap but at a significantly increased cost.

Recommendation 12

Policy should be revised to create a presumption against new crossovers, with Planning to lead on decisions. Where crossovers are permitted, these should seek to minimise changes in level on the pavement (cf recommendation 6) and officers should positively explore the possibility of introducing an annual charge. Any such annual charge should not apply to disabled drivers, though the initial one-off fee should still apply.

Recommendation 13

Existing evidence regarding the importance of the “pedestrian pound” should be collated and presented to Business Improvement District (BID) members for dissemination in order to counter the commonly held belief that customers who drive are more valuable to businesses than those who walk or cycle. Consideration should also be given to commissioning Lambeth-specific research on the “pedestrian pound” to better ascertain the situation locally.

Recommendation 14

As with schools, all businesses in the borough should be encouraged to support sustainable travel. Sustainable travel plans should be promoted and should recommend cycle training which adheres to national standards.

Recommendation 15

The Council should work with Transport for London (TfL) and BIDs to better manage local freight consolidation and distribution to ensure there is adequate provision for deliveries. This could include reviewing policy on waiting and loading times.

Section 3: Enforcement and Joining Up of Environmental Functions

Part of the commission's vision for the future of our streets and public spaces concerns the establishment of a more joined up approach to environmental functions and, in particular, enforcement. This includes as a central aim the consolidation of enforcement functions, including parking and anti-social behaviour (the latter covering such issues as dog fouling, littering and fly-tipping). Such an approach allows for greater coordination and a more efficient use of resources, and was discussed and debated in the *Management of our Streets* workshop at the stakeholder summit.

The commission notes that the Cabinet Member delegated decision report *Parking and Civil Enforcement and Related Services* (August 2016) sets out the first steps towards the type of enforcement service envisaged. While encouraged by this, it merely sets out the framework for beginning to transform the service, and the commission is keen to ensure that this is properly followed through. In particular, the organisation of the service on a neighbourhood basis, which would give rise to a more personable and focused service to residents and businesses in each locality, is considered important.

It is also vital, for the commission's vision of a genuinely joined up public realm, that enforcement and physical provision across streets and housing estates be harmonised. It should be noted that the intention here is not to standardise fees and charges – which should remain separate in order to ensure appropriate consideration of local circumstances – but to make sure estates are not left behind when improvements are planned and that works do not begin an end at estate boundaries, thus integrating them properly into the borough's streetscape.

As noted elsewhere in the report, improving air quality is one of the paramount issues facing the council and the commission has sought to dovetail its work with the development of the council's *Air Quality Action Plan* accordingly. In order that trends can be mapped, hot spots identified, and appropriate action considered, it is recommended that Civil Enforcement Officers be equipped with air quality monitoring equipment as soon as is practicable.

Recommendation 16

A more joined up environmental enforcement function should be established, aimed at consolidating a range of enforcement services including parking, anti-social behaviour (ASB), fly-tipping and dog fouling. This should be organised on a neighbourhood basis.

Recommendation 17

Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) should be equipped with appropriate technology to enable easy capturing and publishing of offences, and air quality monitoring.

Recommendation 18

Housing estates and streets should be considered equitably and in an integrated manner when public realm improvements are planned, and parking enforcement should be seamless across estates and streets, notwithstanding current and future permit charging regimes.

Section 4: Communications

The commission believes communications play an important role in effecting the behaviour change that will be necessary to deliver the sort of town centres and neighbourhoods envisaged in this report, and that a “carrot and stick” approach – consisting of education on one hand and enforcement on the other – is generally accepted as a sound way of achieving such behaviour change. To this end, five recommendations are made regarding specific areas the commission sees as particularly important.

The first of these – constituting the “stick” – focuses on increased publicity in relation to offences, as it is considered that greater awareness of the potential consequences of offending will help deter people doing so in the first place. It is proposed that this covers a range of offences, from minor transgressions like littering to the sort of major offences that can result in court proceedings – thus also reducing the resources that need to be spent on costly prosecutions. The commission notes and welcomes the enforcement arrangements, including publicity, detailed in the Healthier High Streets Scrutiny Commission action plan update taken at Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November 2016 and wishes to see the recommendations below taken on board as part of this as appropriate.

The commission also seeks assurance that blue badge holders in the borough are being given adequate information on their rights and responsibilities. This should include full details of all disabled parking spaces in Lambeth and should build on the Department for Transport’s guidance by providing more specific localised information. It is noted that the borough-wide Parking Feasibility Study will produce an up-to-date inventory of all types of parking provision in the borough, and this should be made available on the website as well as being used as the basis of the information disseminated to blue badge holders.

The commission considers it important, especially against the backdrop of continued reductions in resources across the public sector, that residents are made aware of the various ways in which the parking surplus is spent. This is not just for reasons of financial transparency but also in order to counter some of the negative publicity which often arises in relation to local authority parking fines. A recommendation is therefore made suggesting a suitable awareness campaign.

The final recommendation centres on the collaborative sharing of information and best practice through London Councils, which members consider has dwindled considerably in recent years yet through which more effective solutions to the issues identified in this report are likely to arise. London Councils should also act as a forum through which to conduct appropriate lobbying, of central and the Mayor of London in particular.

Recommendation 19

In order to support behaviour change, an awareness/publicity campaign in relation to enforcement of minor offences should be carried out, while also highlighting high profile prosecutions. A log of minor offences committed should also be published regularly.

Recommendation 20

The rights and responsibilities of blue badge holders in terms of parking in the borough should be better publicised.

Recommendation 21

Clear and comprehensive details of car and cycle parking across the borough should be made available online, based on a robust asset record database, as and when the information becomes available (the commission notes that the parking feasibility study will be gathering much of this data).

Recommendation 22

An awareness/publicity campaign should be conducted regarding the ways in which the parking surplus is spent.

Recommendation 23

Full use should be made of London Councils as a forum to share ideas and best practice, lobby the Mayor of London and central government and in particular contribute to the London Plan.

Annex 1: Acknowledgements

The Commission would like to thank all those who have contributed to its work, in particular the local residents, expert witnesses and others who have submitted evidence, given up their time to attend meetings and responded to consultations:

Paul Dodd (Out Design)
John Dales (Urban Movement)
Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite (Cabinet Member for Environment & Sustainability LBL)
Raj Mistry (Programme Director, Environment LBL)
Richard Lancaster (Programme Manager, Environment LBL)
John Rider (Delivery Lead, Strategic Transport LBL)
Peter Loveday (Transport Policy Manager LBL)
Laura Cheyne (Road Danger Reduction Manager LBL)
Andrew Round (Sustainability Manager LBL)
Zak Aktas (CPZ Project Manager LBL)
Cllr Jackie Meldrum (Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care LBL)
Diana Bell (Clapham Society)
Martin Pratt (Clapham Society)
Charlie Holland (Lambeth Cyclists)
Anne Jaluzot (Green Infrastructure Planning)
Isabelle Clement (Wheels for Wellbeing)
Andrea Hoffling (Kennington Oval & Vauxhall Forum)
Helen Monger (Kennington Oval & Vauxhall Forum)
Louise Abbotts (Streatham BID)
Ben Stephenson (Waterloo BID)
Elaine Kramer (Van Gogh Walk)
Nicole Harris (Taxi Ranks Liaison Officer TfL)
Darren Crowson (Taxi Ranks Liaison Manager TfL)
Naveed Ahmed (Car Clubs Officer TfL)
Jeremy Leach (20's Plenty for Us)
Alan Piper (Brixton Society)
Jack Skillen (Streets for People)
Neil Salt (Streatham Action Group)
Abigail Tripp (Disability Advice Service Lambeth)
Margaret Naughton (Streatham resident)

Annex 2: Commission Scope

Commission members: **Cllr Nigel Haselden (co-chair)**
 Cllr Rob Hill (co-chair)
 Cllr Marsha de Cordova
 Cllr Diana Morris
 Cllr Annie Gallop

Councillor(s) submitting proposal	Nigel Haselden
Title	Equality Streets: Parking in a Liveable Lambeth
Reason for inquiry	<p>Parking of vehicles is of perennial interest across the borough and has explicit and implicit importance for all sections of the population. The subject has sufficient social, environmental and financial importance, as outlined below, to require strategic scrutiny and potential review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Controlled parking, introduced in the mid-90s, is in a mature state in Lambeth, but carries legacies of presumed land use priorities and streetscape that can contrast with good urban design and evolving transport practice. 2. The competition for a share of kerbside is framed in consultative and legislative practice that derives from a period with different expectations of how our streets should or could be used. 3. At different points in the borough there is continuing interest in extending controlled parking, reflecting the common use of unregulated kerbside for commuter parking. Displacement issues usually derive from a new CPZ. 4. Only two in every five Lambeth households now run a car, with the trend heading for one in three. 5. Pay-as-you-go motoring has mushroomed, with each club car providing the capacity equivalent of 20 private car usages. 6. People moving within and through Lambeth's neighbourhoods choose different modes, in much greater numbers, compared to earlier times (at Vauxhall, in peak hours, only one in ten journeys is made by private car) 7. Secure parking for bicycles has become more widely available, but a likely lag in provision at the domestic end of the journey, at estate and street properties, may be linked to an unactivated latent demand to cycle. 8. Significant changes in online and high street trading impact on service deliveries and bring higher expectations for place-making, respectively. 9. Parking in gardens has become widespread and has significantly degraded some of the borough's streets; it erodes the public/private buffer to homes, removes trees and increases rainwater runoff and flood risk. 10. The borough permits crossovers for a small charge (rather than a rental fee) forfeiting the revenue from a parking permit(s) and increasing parking stress by stripping out communal parking space.

	Proposal: 1. a primer report, collating headline data, main policies, stakeholder ambitions and external comparison; 2. a one-day public session with witnesses giving short, sharp contributions in a single, communal hearing (cf PechaKucha/Lightning Talk/Ignite events); 3. a recommendation report.
Time constraints	<p><i>If the commission needs to be considered within a specific time frame please state here and why.</i></p> <p>There are local pressures for an extension of controlled parking and a comprehensive parking feasibility study is being carried out, suggesting an early commission would be timely (the compact format would support this). It is envisaged that the commission will provide a qualitative evidence base for policy development to be considered in 2016. Though the commission and the study are separate discrete pieces of work, it would be prudent to align the ToRs for later correlation.</p>
Proposed completion date	The commission will take place on Monday 21 September 2015 at Roots and Shoots in Kennington. The primer report will be produced beforehand and included in delegates' packs to provide background information and a starting point for discussions. The final report will be produced in late 2015.
Core Questions	<p><i>What are the core questions the commission is seeking to answer (no more than three)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the council's strategic parking policy fit the constraints facing the borough and the ambitions it holds for a clean and green Lambeth? • What opportunities are there for the council and partners to configure legislative, physical and financial aspects of vehicle parking policy and practice to play a positive part in our town centres and residential areas?
Desired outcome	<p><i>What is the purpose of the review in one sentence?</i></p> <p>To ensure council policy and practice in the field of vehicle parking provide appropriately and equitably for the borough's future social needs and its environmental priorities.</p>
Terms of reference	<p><i>These will set out the key lines of the commission's inquiry and broadly be in the format:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>'To understand/investigate/appraise/analyse/review/compare etc....'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To receive a summary of current policy • To compare the provision and demand for parking in the borough, in alignment with the parking feasibility study, but including domestic off-street and cycle parking • To identify how the frameworks defining controlled and wider parking provision can improve the attractiveness of neighbourhoods and make active travel easier.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider the scope and possible benefits of a borough-wide CPZ.
What will not be included	<p><i>This will assist in setting the boundaries for the commission's work and prevent 'scope-creep'.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual design forms and solutions, although these could be appended as recommendations. • Actual settings and streets, except where a case study can support report-writing or help to ground a submission
Risks (mitigation)	<p><i>What risks are there to the commission completing its work? Other pieces of work the commission may be dependent upon should be included.</i></p> <p>Risks could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure all viewpoints are represented (careful targeting of invitees should avoid this) • The wide-reaching nature of the commission leading to recommendations which are less than specific • The timescales involved with policy review and development leading to a delay in acting on the commission's recommendations
Equality & Diversity considerations	<i>Advice from Equalities Team</i>
Possible co-options	<p><i>Would the commission's work benefit from having a co-optee throughout its work or would such involvement be better facilitated through 'expert witness' sessions?</i></p> <p>It is anticipated that an expert witness approach is the appropriate format for the scrutiny. Potential stakeholders are listed below but it is not envisaged any of these will be co-opted onto the commission.</p>
Key stakeholders/ consultees	<p><i>Include opportunities to involve the public (Service users/general public/voluntary sector/other authorities/non-governmental organisations/lobby groups/academics/private sector/target group representatives etc.)</i></p> <p>TBC, but including: Living Streets, Urban Design London, practitioners, eg John Dales of Urban Movement, ATCM (town centre managers), London Cyclists, Sustrans, Wheels for Wellbeing, 20's plenty, mobility groups, local amenity groups, BIDs, car club representatives, taxi drivers' representative</p>
Portfolio holder(s)	Cabinet Members for Environment & Sustainability, for Neighbourhoods and possibly for Jobs & Growth, concerning planning aspects.
Potential witnesses	<i>Who will the commission need to take written or oral evidence from in order to meet its terms of reference?</i>

	Officers: parking, highways, transport policy, sustainable transport, urban design & conservation, planning enforcement, housing, town centre management. See also key stakeholders above.
Research/Evidence required	<p><i>Consider what information the commission will need to gather to meet its terms of reference. How will the commission gather its evidence? Will specialist work need to be commissioned?</i></p> <p>A large proportion of information required from the council should be currently available to be drawn down and stakeholder contributions can often be position statements by their organisation.</p>
Potential site visits	<p><i>Would the commission's work benefit from any site visits?</i></p> <p>This could be helpful and will be investigated.</p>
Timescales	<p><i>What are members' general requirements, suggestions or other constraints?</i></p> <p><i>Update into a an outline plan:</i></p> <p>Early September 2015 – primer report 21 September 2015 – commission event Late 2015 – final report and recommendations to Cabinet</p>
Publicity	<p><i>Generally press releases are issued at the start and end of commissions, however additional publicity (e.g. for public meetings) may be appropriate</i></p> <p>Poster/flyers, targeted invitations and social media. The event will be invite-only but it is anticipated publicity will accompany the final report.</p>
Links to Community Outcomes/ Resident Priorities	Cleaner Streets; Safer Communities

Annex 3: Background Documents

- LB Lambeth [Community Plan 2013-16](#) (April 2013)
- LB Lambeth [Future Lambeth: Our Borough Plan 2016-2021](#) (Sept 2016)
- LB Lambeth [Health and Wellbeing Strategy Refresh](#) (Sept 2016)
- LB Lambeth [Lambeth Local Plan](#) (Sept 2015)
- LB Lambeth [Lambeth Transport Plan 2011](#)
- LB Lambeth [Long Term Transport Strategy Baseline Report](#) (Oct 2016)
- LB Lambeth [Parking and Civil Enforcement and Related Services \(Cabinet Member Delegated Decision Report\)](#) (Aug 2016)
- LB Lambeth [Air Quality Action Plan 2017-2022 \(Consultation Draft\)](#) (June 2016)
- LB Lambeth [Overview and Scrutiny Committee 16 Nov 2016 \(Agenda Pack and Minutes\)](#)
- Transport for London [Town Centre Study 2009](#) (June 2011)
- Transport for London [Town Centre Study 2011](#) (Sept 2011)
- Accent (for Transport for London) [Town Centres 2013](#) (June 2013)
- Living Streets [The Pedestrian Pound: The Business Case for Better Streets and Places](#) (2014)
- Steer Davies Gleave (for LB Lambeth) *Borough-Wide Two-Way Cycling in One-Way Streets Study* (2016)
- Trees and Design Action Group [Trees in Hard Landscapes: A Guide for Delivery](#) (Sept 2014)
- London Councils [Code of Practice for Affixing Traffic Signs and Street Lighting to Buildings in London](#) (June 2015) (adopted by LB Lambeth's Cabinet on 8 Feb 2016)
- Transport for All article: [Zero tolerance on A-boards welcomed by disabled people](#) (Feb 2015)
- GLA Environment Committee: [Crazy Paving: The Environmental Importance of London's Front Gardens](#) (Sept 2005)
- inStreatham Business Improvement District [Streatham Street Manual](#) (2014)
- Department for Transport [Blue Badge Scheme: Rights and Responsibilities in England](#)